

Applicants: Gérard Hascoët and Thierry Pechoux  
Serial No.: 10/603,587  
Filed: June 25, 2003  
Page 10 of 13

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were pending in the subject application. By this amendment, Claims 1-17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claims 18-53 have been added.

Applicants maintain that the new claims do not raise an issue of new matter. Support for the new claims can be found at least in the original claims as follows: new independent Claim 18 - original Claims 1 and 8; new independent Claim 30 - original Claims 1 and 14; new independent Claim 44 - original Claims 1 and 16; new Claims 19, 33, and 47 - original Claim 9; new Claims 20, 34, and 48 - original Claim 10; new Claims 21, 35, and 49 - original Claims 2 and 3; new Claims 22, 36, and 50 - original Claim 4; new Claims 23 and 37 - original Claim 6; new Claims 24, 38, and 51 - original Claim 7; new Claims 25, 39-40 and 52 - original Claim 11; new Claims 26-28 and 41-42 - original Claim 12; new Claims 29, 43, and 53 - original Claim 13; new Claim 31 - original Claim 15; new Claim 32 - original Claim 8; new Claim 45 - original Claim 17; and new Claim 46 - original Claim 16.

The specification has been amended to update the priority data for the subject application. Applicants maintain that the amendment to the specification does not raise an issue of new matter.

Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-17 were rejected as indefinite due to issues regarding claim language. Applicants understand that this rejection is now moot in view of the cancelation of Claims 1-17. Applicants maintain that the new claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants: Gérard Hascoët and Thierry Pechoux  
Serial No.: 10/603,587  
Filed: June 25, 2003  
Page 11 of 13

Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-17 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,034.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,232.

Applicants attach hereto two Terminal Disclaimers in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) in order to remove the double patenting rejections over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,605,034 and 6,350,232. A fee of \$130.00 is required for submitting each Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, a check including the \$260.00 fee for submitting two Terminal Disclaimers is enclosed.

In view of the Terminal Disclaimers attached hereto, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these double patenting rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that Claims 3, 5, 8-10 and 14-17 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

New independent Claim 18 incorporates features of Claim 8 and Claim 1. New independent Claim 30 incorporates features of Claim 14 and Claim 1. New independent Claim 44 incorporates features of Claim 16 and Claim 1. The rest of the new claims are dependent claims that correspond to subject matter presented in the original claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully maintain that the new claims correspond to allowable subject matter identified by the Examiner.

Applicants: Gérard Hascoët and Thierry Pechoux  
Serial No.: 10/603,587  
Filed: June 25, 2003  
Page 12 of 13

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12 and 13 were rejected as anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,660). Applicants understand that this rejection is now moot in view of the claim amendments made herein above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,660) in view of Rodsten (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,374). Applicants understand that this rejection is now moot in view of the claim amendments made herein above.

Applicants: Gérard Hascoët and Thierry Pechoux  
Serial No.: 10/603,587  
Filed: June 25, 2003  
Page 13 of 13

### CONCLUSIONS


In view of amendments and remarks made hereinabove and the two Terminal Disclaimers attached hereto, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections set forth in the April 7, 2008 Office Action and earnestly solicit allowance of the claims now pending in the subject application.

A check for \$1,060.00 is enclosed for the \$260.00 fee for filing two Terminal Disclaimers and the \$800.00 fee for filing 16 claims in excess of 20 claims (\$50.00 per excess claim). No other fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this reply. However, if any additional fee is required to preserve the pendency of the subject application, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 01-1785. Overpayments may also be credited to Deposit Account No. 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted,

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10016  
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York  
June 25, 2008

By:   
Alan D. Miller, Reg. No. 42,889